

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 11-12 and 17-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification is amended and claims 1, 5 and 7-8 are amended. Claims 3-4 and 9-10 are canceled without disclaimer or prejudice. Claims 6 and 13-14 were canceled by previous amendment. Claims 15-20 are added. The amendments introduce no new matter.

Applicant appreciates the Office Action's indication that claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 contain allowable subject matter. However, for at least the reason discussed below, the Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are allowable.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended to Applicant's representatives by Examiner Lee in the June 7, 2006 personal interview. The points discussed are incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. Matters of Form**

The Office Action objects to the reference labels in the description of the drawings. The specification has been amended consistent with the Examiner's suggestion to obviate this objection. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action maintains the objection to the amendment filed June 2, 2005, asserting that it introduces new matter. The specification has been amended to obviate this objection. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 3, 9 and 10 have been canceled by this amendment. Rejection of claims 3, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is moot.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 were objected to for minor informalities. Claims 1, 4 and 5 have been amended consistent with the Examiner's suggestion. Withdrawal of the objections to claims 1, 4 and 5 is respectfully requested.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stones or Deslandes. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of allowable claim 4. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Stones or Deslandes. Claim 3 has been canceled in this Amendment. The rejection of claim 3 is moot.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Stones or Deslandes. Claim 11 is dependent on claim 1, and inherits all the features thereof. Claim 11 is patentable at least for its dependence on independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Deslandes. Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1, and inherits all the features thereof. Claim 2 is patentable for at least this reason, as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

**III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Deslandes. Claim 12 is dependent on claim 1, and is patentable for at least this reason as well as for the additional features it recites. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stones or Deslandes in view of Takenoshita (all of record). Claims 9 and 10 have been canceled in this Amendment. Rejection of claims 9 and 10 is moot.

**IV. Objection to Dependent Claims**

Claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 4 was dependent on claim 1. Claim 1 was amended to include the features recited in claim 4. Claim 4 is canceled.

Claim 5 was dependent on claim 4. Claim 5 is amended to depend on claim 1.

Claim 7 was dependent on claim 1. Claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of previous claim 1.

Claim 8 was dependent on claim 3. Claim 3 was dependent on claim 1. Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of claims 3 and 1.

Withdrawal of the objections to claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim is respectfully requested.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Donald A. DiPaula  
Registration No. 58,115

JAO:DAD/eks

Date: June 28, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--